DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 550 HE 012 842

AUTHOR Jones, Susan Holtzer
TITLE Student Participation in Governance at UC Davis.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 31p.: Prepared through the Office of Student Affairs.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy: *College Administration: *College Students: Decision Making: *Governance: Graduate Students: Higher Education: Institutional Research: Models: Research Projects: School Surveys: *Student Attitudes: *Student College Relationship: *Student Participation: Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

Survey results pertaining to the development of a campus plan for student participation for the University of California at Davis campus are presented. The data were derived from a two-part questionnaire, which is appended. Part one contains five questions designed to measure levels of student participation, and part two contains six open-ended questions designed to elicit information regarding procedures, values, and attitudes toward participation. Findings include the following: nearly all academic departments report student participation, while a large proportion of administrative units have no students involved in decision making: student participants are selected by their peers more often in academic departments than in administrative units: graduate students participate more in proportion to their numbers: graduate students participate far more in academic departments while undergraduates participate far more in administrative units: and communication was seen as the chief purpose and value of student participation. Two models of student participation are described, and a presidential statement of university policy on student participation in governance is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Holtzer Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED188550

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE AT UC DAVIS

Susan Holtzer Jones
Office of Student Affairs
Research and Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Background of the Study

This report is part of a Universitywide concern with the role of students in academic governance, stretching over nearly a decade of study, analysis and policy evolution. Its background includes the Oswald Report (1969) and the Report of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Student Participation (1977); its direct impetus is University President David S. Saxon's Statement of University Policy on Student Participation in Governance (1979), which is included in the Appendix.

As part of this statement, each campus has been "charged with the development of a plan for student participation," requiring both an examination of "the type and extent of student participation," and "a review of the procedures presently used by campus academic and administrative departments." This report attempts to provide data for the development of a campus plan for the Davis campus.

The data were derived from a two-page, two-part questionnaire developed by the staff of the Office of Student Affairs. Part I contained five questions designed to measure levels of student participation; Part II contained six open-ended questions to elicit information regarding procedures, values and attitudes toward participation. The questionnaire was mailed broadcast throughout the campus; because of this distribution procedure, it is impossible to determine exactly how many individual units (and thus a population figure) were surveyed.

A total of 98 units responded to the survey; these have been separated for analytic purposes into academic (n=60) and nonacademic units (n=38). The only response rate which can be computed is within the undergraduate colleges, 73% of whose units responded to the questionnaire. This breaks down to 71% for the College of Letters and Science, 77% for the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, and 71% for the College of Engineering.

A summary of responses is contained in the Appendix. The n in each case represents the number of respondents to that particular question. Responses have been grouped into analytic categories in the body of the report; in addition, because this survey is to a great extent exploratory in nature, lists of individual items mentioned are included in the Appendix, to provide information about the scope of the responses. A caveat--because of the open-ended nature of the questions, categories of responses were to some extent in the eye of the beholder; responses to Part II should be approached more from a qualitative than a quantitative perspective.

HE 012 842

Summary And Analysis

In raw numbers, Davis offers substantial opportunities for student participation in governance. A total of 1,236 individual students were reported involved in formal meetings and/or committees. Based on fall, 1978 enrollment of 17,511, this partial number represents 7.1% of the student body.

Nearly all academic departments include student participation, while a large proportion of administrative units do not. Only three academic units (7%) reported no student participation, whereas 16 administrative units (42%) had no students involved in decision-making.

Student participants are selected by their peers more often in academic departments than in administrative units. Only 15% of students participating in administrative units are student-selected, compared to 31% of participants in academic governance. At the same time, graduate students in academic departments were somewhat more likely (34% of cases) to be peer-selected than undergraduates (23% of cases).

Graduate students participate more in proportion to their numbers. Even though participation among graduates and undergraduates is approximately equal in number, the 613 reported graduates represent 13% of the 4,871 graduate enrollment, while the 623 undergraduates participating are only 5% of their 12,640 enrollment.

Graduate students participate far more in academic departments, undergraduates far more in administrative units. Among graduate students, 484 were involved in academic governance, 128 in administrative units; among undergraduates, the proportions are almost reversed--172 participated in academic departments, 451 in administrative units.

Graduate students are represented in more units than undergraduates. Graduates participate in 62% of all units reporting, compared to 47% for undergraduates. Graduates participate in 77% of academic departments, and only 39% of administrative units, while undergraduates participate in 47% of both types of units.

Academic departments more than administrative units receive student opinions of their programs and operations. Forty-seven academic departments (78%) reported using regular course and program evaluations, compared to 13 administrative units (34%). And 21 academic departments (35%) administered at least one student survey within the last two years, compared to 16 administrative units (42%).

While most participation on campus is based on custom or ad hoc decision rather than formal policy, this is even more the case among academic departments than among administrative units. Only 22% of academic departments reported a formal written or voted-upon policy, while administrative units reported participation was based on formal policy 36% of the time.

Communication was seen as the chief purpose and value of student participation. Among both academic and administrative units, two-way interaction between students and university was considered the major goal of participation. A large number of units specified student opinion and/or input as important; an almost equally large number mentioned communicating to students as important, especially informing students about the reasoning and procedures underlying decisions.

Units split almost equally in their preference for formal vs. informal types of participation. This pattern was true among both academic and administrative units. Proponents of informal participation mentioned its capability of providing two-way communication and suggested formality was unnecessary in smaller units. Formality was favored for its structure and clarity.

MODELS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION

While the survey indicates that specific processes governing student participation vary widely from unit to unit, certain broad patterns do emerge. To the extent that student participation is one element of unit governance, that participation should vary depending upon the type of governance structure in which it is embedded.

Given this data, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that Davis maintains two very different governance structures. These may be considered the Collegial Model and the Bureaucratic Model.

There are three variables in particular which might best describe the characteristic differences between the two models, particularly as they relate to student participation. First, there is degree of formality, both structural and procedural; second, locus of authority; and finally, role and status of the participants.

Because the survey was not designed to study these variables, the available data does not provide quantitative measures. However, certain general trends can be discerned and, at the very least, future directions for research can be suggested by this paradigm.

The collegial model may be characterized, first, as being less formal than its bureaucratic counterpart, with less specified structure and fewer specified processes. The collegial locus of authority would be more decentralized, with decision-making power being held at more than one point of the structure; the bureaucratic model, on the other hand, would have a one-person, "buck stops here" authority structure, with ultimate authority and ultimate responsibility concentrated at a single point. Finally, participation in the collegial model would be individually-based, whereas participation in the bureaucratic model would be representational.

The data suggest, not surprisingly, a relationship at least between the first two variables, and the use of different models by type of unit. As would be expected, the collegial model is found primarily (although not exclusively) among academic departments, while the bureaucratic model is used primarily (but again not exclusively) by administrative units.

These are of course generalized characterizations; some academic departments operate in a far more bureaucratic pattern than some administrative units. In addition, no unit is likely to be either wholly collegial or wholly bureaucratic; the two models may best be considered as a continuum. With these caveats, however, student participation may be contrasted within these models.

Formality. Academic departments are distinctly less formal than their administrative counterparts. As noted above, for instance, a larger proportion of participation in administrative units (36%) is based on formal written or voted-upon policy, compared to academic departments (22%). In addition, another 13% of administrative participation is based on employee status. Thus, while 88% of academic participation is based on custom or *ad hoc* policy, only 51% of administrative participation is this informal.

Similar differences in formality are evident in the process of selecting student participants. Of those meetings and committees for which selection process was reported, students were selected by staff or faculty 53% of the time in administrative groups, compared to only 23% in academic groups. Fifty-six percent of academic groups had student participants selected by other students, compared to only 17% of administrative groups.

Even more evidence of informality, however, is indicated by the 16% of academic groups which were open to either student volunteers or all interested students. This category did not show up at all in administrative groups.

Perhaps the most meaningful measure of formality is in the decision-making process itself. Unfortunately, these data are too murky to provide a truly accurate index; there are, however, several suggestive points.

In particular, there are the comments and responses to the question of student voting rights on meetings and committees. Many academic departments did not provide direct answers to this question; in fact, while there were a total 222 academic meetings and committees, there were only 138 responses to the question of student role. Instead, many respondents indicated that the question was irrelevant because no votes were taken; decisions were not majority-based but were, rather, consensual. And in these situations, respondents indicated students were full participants.

Administrative units, on the other hand, generally had clearer (i.e., more formal) procedures. Students either voted or they did not--the number of student-role responses exactly matched the number of reported meetings and committees.

Finally, there is a good deal more face-to-face, conversational interaction between students and faculty or staff in academic departments, and the departments, at least, consider this a participatory mechanism. Little of this sort of informal contact is reported in administrative units.

Locus of Authority. One of the principal differences between the collegial and bureaucratic models is the point within the structure at which decisions are finalized. The collegial model is a weak-executive system in which decisions can be, and are, made at various points up and down the line. On the other hand, the bureaucratic pyramid has a clearly-defined line of authority based on the ultimate responsibility of the person at the top. The bureaucratic executive may consult subordinates, but does not actually yield final decision-making power.

At Davis, the departmental committee system is generally a true authority structure, whereas the administrative committee system is always somewhat limited in its role. This distinction has considerable implications for questions of student participation; based on these models, students would not in fact ever truly share authority within a bureaucratic structure, whereas they may indeed share collegial authority.

At Davis, a student voting on a departmental curriculum committee, for instance, is likely to be participating in actual decision-making; the same student with the same vote on an administrative committee is still one step removed from actual authority. Thus, a student with advisory status on a departmental committee is really in the same relationship to authority as a student with voting status on the administrative committee. Voting rights on an advisory committee are equivalent in role to advisory rights on a decisional committee.

Status of Participants. The final variable on which these models of governance should differ is in the status and role of their participants. There is very little empirical evidence on this point in the survey. Theoretically, however, participants in the collegial model should be considered primarily colleagues, while those in the bureaucratic model should be either constituents or subordinates.

Collegial participants, for instance, would be presumed to hold a certain communality of interests; a constituency, on the other hand, is conceptualized as a meta-group composed of subgroups with differing and often competing interests.

A collegial relationship also presupposes at least a minimal level of equality, in rights and responsibilities rather than in knowledge or ability. In a constituent relationship, however, there is a single locus at which competing claims are apportioned; the claimants themselves do not deal with each other directly or on a basis of equality.

Finally, collegiality implies joint membership of all participants in a single whole. Therefore, participation is primarily individual; with everyone a member, there is no need for representation. Within a constituency relationship, however, participation should be primarily representational; that is, participants should represent a particular group or subgroup, rather than being present merely for the input or expertise they themselves can offer.

If this theoretical picture is accurate, then students participating in administrative units, which tend more toward the bureaucratic model, would be serving more often as representatives of other students than merely for their own expertise or value. Yet it is in just these units that students are least often selected by other students, which should bring their true representativeness into question more than in academic departments, whose participants are much more often selected by their peers.

Conclusions. One statement made at the beginning of this section bears reemphasis here--although there is a high correlation between the two governance structure, these are models of processes, not of unit types. There are indeed administrative units that operate through a preponderantly collegial model, and there are also academic departments as thoroughly bureaucratic as General Motors. Therefore, these models are not automatically restricted to use by one type of unit or another.

In terms of maximizing student participation in actual governance decisions, the collegial model offers both more risk and more reality. Because of its informality, this model does not lend itself to rigid codification or enforcement, and it is also more open to potential abuse or non-use.

On the other hand, the collegial model, when it is properly used, offers more opportunities for sharing of actual authority than does the bureaucratic model. Student participants in the collegial model deal with real decisions in real decision-making situations, rather than being merely in advisory situations removed from authority.

Within the severe limits of this survey, the data at least suggest a correlation between degree of formalization and locus of authority, because each of these correlates with types of unit. This is a generally conceded point in organizational analysis. However, a critical question for the purposes of student participation is direction of causality; if increased formalization is causally linked to increased centralization of authority, then codifying and formalizing student participation procedures at Davis might tend to lessen, rather than increase, the involvement of students in true decision-making.

Elements of Analysis

Survey data indicate that, in raw numbers, Davis offers substantial opportunities for student participation in governance. The 98 units responding report a total of 1,236 individual students involved in formal meetings and/or committees, as well as additional involvement through student associations, surveys and a variety of informal mechanisms. Even based on total enrollment (17,511 in fall, 1978), this partial number represents 7.1% of the student body formally participating in governance. Further analysis, however, indicates both quantitative and qualitative differences between graduate and undergraduate participation, and between participation in academic and nonacademic units.

Thus, even though opportunities for graduates and undergraduates are approximately equal in number, the 613 reported graduate participants represent 12.6% of the 4,871 graduate enrollment, while the 623 undergraduates participating are only 4.9% of their 12,640 total enrollment. By and large, graduate students have greater opportunities for participation within academic units, while undergraduates are represented more often in administrative units.

Graduate students are also represented in a great proportion of units--62%, compared to 47% for undergraduates. Graduate students participate in 77% of academic and 39% of nonacademic units, compared to 47% of both academic and nonacademic units for undergraduates.

There are other relevant differences between academic and nonacademic units. For one, academic participation tends to be more decisional--that is, faculty meetings and departmental committees are generally actual decision-making bodies, and students participating are therefore involved in the full process. Nonacademic committees, however, are often (although certainly not always) advisory in function; thus, a student may have full voting rights on an administrative committee, but have less actual decision-making capacity than a student with only limited voting rights on a departmental committee.

The two types of units also differ in the nature of their processes. Academic units tend to be more informal, both in selection of participants and internal operating procedures. Many of these respondents indicated that the question of "voting rights" was meaningless to them because decisions were consensual rather than formal; thus, in many academic units, students' "advisory" status represents full participation.

In both student selection and procedures, nonacademic units tended to be more formalized. More students are selected by administrators, or participate because of their status as unit employees (often, in fact, such participation is required). Thus, since the bulk of undergraduate participation is within these units, fewer of them than of graduates are selected by their peers.

Finally, academic and nonacademic units often differ in the nature of the participants. Students participating in academic-unit governance are nearly always direct unit constituents--i.e., students majoring in or otherwise involved in the field. Among nonacademic units, this pattern is more varied. While participation may be constituency-based in some cases, in others (such as campus-wide Advisory Committees), students represent the student body as a whole.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR DIRECT STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Meetings and Committees

Academic Units. While levels of student participation vary, nearly all departments have at least some degree of student input. Of the 45 non-professional-school teaching departments in the survey, 29% have no students attending regular meetings and 16% have no students on any unit committees; however, only 7% (three departments) have no students involved in either.

The 60 academic units responding reported 220 regularly-occurring meetings and committees, with student participation in 74%. Among them, these groups provide a total of 656 individual opportunities for student participation.

Student participation is greater on committees than at unit meetings--students sit on 74% of unit committees, compared to 52% of regular meetings. They also play a more active role on committees, with either full or limited voting rights on 62% compared to only 26% of meetings.

The survey indicates that graduate students have substantially greater opportunities for participation than do undergraduates. They attend 46% of meetings, compared to 21% for undergraduates, and sit on 65% of unit committees, compared to 29% for undergraduates. Thus, a total of 484 individual opportunities exist for graduate student participation, as opposed to 172 for undergraduates.

Graduate students not only have more opportunities for participation, they are also more often selected by their peers. In 55% of cases reported, graduate students were selected by other students or student groups, compared to 36% for undergraduates. They were selected by faculty or unit designation in only 25% of cases, while undergraduates were selected by the unit 43% of the time. (See Table I).

Table I

Graduate and Undergraduate Participation and Selection in Academic Units

	Graduates		Undergraduates	
	n	% student-selected	n	% student-selected
Meetings attended	31	55	14	21
Number of students	170	24	70	9
Committees attended	99	55	45	40
Number of students	314	40	102	33
Total groups attended	130	55	59	36
Number of students	484	34	172	23

Nonacademic Units. Many of the nonacademic units responding reported only those meetings and/or committees which did have some student participation. Thus, it is impossible to determine the proportion of regularly-occurring sessions with and without students. The percentages reported below, therefore, are based on those committees and meetings which do include student participants. Additionally, many did not differentiate between meetings and committees; the two have therefore been tallied together.

The 38 administrative units responding reported a total of 95 meetings and committees with student participation. These provide a total of 580 individual opportunities for student involvement.

Nonacademic units include more undergraduate than graduate participation. Undergraduates participate in 89% of groups compared to 60% for graduate students and 51% with both. A total of 451 undergraduates and 129 graduate students are participants. (See Table II)

Table II

Meetings and Committees with Student Participants

	Academic Units (n=163)	Nonacademic Units (n=95)
Graduate students attending	80%	60%
Undergraduates attending	36%	89%
Both levels attending	16%	51%

In 62% of cases, students had full voting rights, with limited voting rights in another 6% and 32% advisory. (However, it should be noted that a large number of these cases represent committees that are themselves advisory.)

In nonacademic units, students are also less often selected by their peers. Only 16% of these groups have students who are student-selected, while participants are selected by administrators 51% of the time, and in 22% of cases, students participate because they are unit employees. Of the total numbers of participants, only 15% are peer-selected. Table III provides a breakdown of the selection process.

More nonacademic than academic units report no regularly-occurring student participation. Forty-two percent report no students attending any regular meeting or committee, and another 8% involve no students other than unit employees.

Informal Involvement

Academic and nonacademic units reported differences in the categories of students most often involved, reflecting primarily the different types of student contact between the two groups. Thus, academic units reported the

Table III

Selection of Students by Nonacademic Units

	Grads (n=116)[1]	Undergrads (n=363)[1]	Total (n=479)[1]
Selected by other students	14%	16%	15%
By virtue of job	10%	59%	47%
By virtue of membership, etc.	16%	1%	5%
By staff/administration	59%	23%	32%
Other	*	*	*

[1]Number of student slots for which selection process was given.

*Less than 1%.

greatest amount of informal involvement by teaching assistants, while nonacademic units had the highest levels of involvement from among student employees.

Of the 60 academic units, 67% reported at least some level of informal participation. Teaching assistants were involved by 52%; research assistants by 22%; student employees by 17%, and other students generally by 37% (many units, of course, reported involvement by more than one of these groups).

Seventy-four percent of the nonacademic units reported some informal involvement. Student employees were involved by 71%; other students generally by 42%; 8% involved research assistants and 5% involved teaching assistants.

Total Opportunities for Direct Student Participation

In all, the survey reports 315 regularly-occurring meetings and committees on the Davis campus which include students. Graduate students participate in 59% of these, undergraduates in 46%.

These groups offer a total of 1,236 individual opportunities to students--613 for graduate students, 623 for undergraduates.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIRECT STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Course and Program Evaluations

Forty-seven academic units reported some form of regular course evaluation procedure, 81% of them every time a course is taught. Most of them (44%) use their own departmental evaluation form; one unit noted: "We have found the best student course/instructor form to be a blank sheet of paper that asks the students for their written opinions." Twenty-five percent leave the choice of form to the instructor and 13% use the Student Viewpoint form.

Among nonacademic units, 13 report that they administer some form of program evaluation on a regular basis.

Surveys of Students

Twenty-one academic units reported 27 different student surveys within the last two years. Of these, 44% were student opinion surveys, 37% were for unit evaluation purposes, and 19% were for data-gathering purposes.

Sixteen nonacademic units also reported having administered one or more surveys (one unit ran six surveys within the last two years). Of the 26 surveys reported, 19% were primarily data-gathering mechanisms, while 31% were for program evaluation purposes and 54% were student opinion surveys.

Student Associations

As in the case of meeting and committee participation, among academic units more opportunities exist in this area for graduate students than for undergraduates. Units reported a total of 83 student associations--51% composed primarily of graduate students, compared to 29% for undergraduates and 20% intended for both levels. There was also a higher degree of faculty involvement with the graduate groups--55% had some faculty membership, whereas only 42% of the undergraduate groups included faculty. Most of these associations had several different purposes, including social, professional/educational, and advisory to the department.

Among nonacademic units, twelve reported affiliated student associations, split almost equally among graduate, undergraduate and mixed participation. Staff participated in seven. Seven of these associations were primarily advisory in purpose; four were social and/or recreational; two were for educational purposes, and three were for business- or job-related purposes.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES

Basis of Student Participation

Of the 50 academic units responding to this question, only 22% reported a formal written and/or voted-upon policy defining student participation. Thirty percent said students participated on the basis of long-term custom, 20% said participation was on an *ad hoc*, case-by-case basis, and 28% said they had no regular policy at all.

Types of Decisions In Which Students Participate

Academic Units. There was general unanimity in some decision areas, and considerable differences in others. There was agreement among all eleven units mentioning student-oriented activities that students participated in these decisions; all 13 units which mentioned budget decisions agreed that students did not participate; and four units said students were not involved in student-personnel matters, such as admissions and retention.

On the other hand, units held disparate views on student participation in unit personnel decisions, such as hiring, promotions and tenure--31 units did not include students, while 15 did. In curriculum and teaching decisions, 21 units included students, three did not. Four units said students helped make decisions regarding facilities and space allocation, while one respondent said they were not included in "important administrative decisions like moving of furniture."

And one respondent commented: "The feeling of the faculty was that students need not be bothered with personnel decisions (which probably means faculty do not want to be bothered by students in personnel decisions)."

Nonacademic Units. There was even less unanimity among these units than among academic ones. In management areas, for instance, including daily operations, budget and long-range policy, 16 units included students in decision-making while 20 said they did not. Seven units included students in hiring and personnel decisions, and an equal number did not. And nine units noted the inclusion of students in decisions relating to services and programs.

Two respondents said students were not included where there were problems of confidentiality. And another said: "Decisions on matters where we feel confident that we know what the student response would be, are made without their input."

Graduate vs. Undergraduate Participation

Responses from academic units indicate a difference in kind as well as degree between graduate and undergraduate involvement in decision-making. A sprinkling of excerpts indicates some of these differences:

"Graduate student participation at Division meetings; undergraduate participation at curriculum meetings."

"Department policy to have graduate students represented at meetings. . . informal input only from undergraduates."

"Graduate students have always been consulted regarding the selection of new faculty members. . .(and) tenure decisions. Students are consulted regarding course content."

Other comments indicate that, where academic units are in the process of increasing student participation, many of these new opportunities are primarily for graduate students:

"New graduate student attendance at the faculty meetings has been quite successful."

"The faculty formally agreed to invite representatives of the Graduate Student Association to participate."

"(We are) now considering a plan to make all graduate students full voting members."

RATIONALE FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION

To most units, the principal rationale for student involvement was communications-based. In questions dealing with the purposes and values of participation, the most frequent responses mentioned student input, interaction, understanding and equivalent phrases.

Neither was communication seen as one-sided. The many references to improved understanding of student viewpoints were balanced by frequent comments about improving students' understanding of university problems and procedures. Interaction was clearly seen to work both ways.

Purposes of Participation

Academic Units. Twenty-eight units indicated that student input into decisions affecting them was a major purpose of participation. For instance, one respondent stated: "Students are entitled to a say in the way their program is run." Another said the department wanted "direct input from our primary clients."

Five units mentioned interaction and a shared sense of community. One referred to "commitment to the department," while another noted it was "to establish better working relationships between students, faculty and staff outside the classroom."

Communicating to students was a specific purpose of participation for four units, including "to communicate to students the reasoning that lies behind specific decisions" and "to inform students concerning the manner in which affairs actually are conducted in the university."

Assisting students was mentioned by seven units. This included particularly an educational function, as noted by the unit which said participation was "to help train students for the leadership and decision-making positions they will occupy later in their careers."

Eight units said one purpose of participation was to help in the actual functioning of the unit itself. One respondent noted student help in evaluating departmental programs and planning; another said it was "to help us do the best possible job of teaching;" and a third said one main purpose was "to increase person-power available to get work done."

Nonacademic Units. In one form or another, these units also emphasized communication as the primary purpose of student participation. Fourteen units specified student input and/or expertise, seven noted the importance of understanding student needs, and another five mentioned improved communication generally. These units also saw communications as a two-way street, as exemplified by the comment that student participation had "partially alleviated much concern and opposition to the establishment of policy and compliance enforcement."

Several also saw more direct purposes--six said one major function of participation was to provide employment for students, three others that it served educational purposes, and five said a major purpose was to improve the services of the unit.

Value of Student Participation

As might be expected from the responses cited above, most units felt the main value of participation lay in the communication area, for both themselves and their students. (Although most units offered multiple responses to this two-part question, many did not distinguish between unit and student value. Therefore, they have been tallied and reported as a single question.)

Academic Units. The largest single group of respondents--17--said the primary value was generalized interaction, understanding and/or improved morale. This includes "better student-faculty relations," "giving students a sense of participation" and "reducing the possibility of misunderstanding between faculty and students."

Of those responses which specified the direction of communication, 11 felt a major value was communication from students, while 16 said a major value was communicating to students. (Some units mentioned both.) For instance, one unit said it benefited from students' "fresh and enthusiastic ideas," and another that they receive "a more realistic perception of what our department and major are like from the undergraduate's standpoint." At the same time, one respondent commented that participation gives students "more realistic expectations," and one noted: "It has emphasized that all controversial decisions involve a series of tradeoffs, and resulted in a better understanding of the complexity of many issues and the manner of arriving at decisions."

Ten units said student participation assisted the department, including reference to improved instruction and decision-making. One said: "Increased student participation allows the department to sponsor activities it could not normally support," and several said they used student-provided information in the decision-making process.

Seven units mentioned the educational function of student participation, such as that "it provides good training in leadership and decision-making." And seven said a chief value lay in giving students a voice in their own affairs. One noted that a potential value to students was that they "no doubt receive better evaluations by becoming better known to the faculty."

Finally, three units said student participation was of little or no value in their individual situations.

Nonacademic Units. These units also emphasized communication values. Student input was mentioned by 23 respondents, interaction by 12, and a better understanding of university operations among students was noted by eleven units. Four others cited morale values. One unit said student participation resulted in "fewer complaints about available services," and another noted "reduction of abuse of equipment because they see this as 'their' facility."

Participation was also seen to have more direct value to the students themselves. Sixteen units mentioned educational and skills-development values, another 14 said they provided employment and work experience, and nine mentioned such personal values as citizenship and personal satisfaction. One unit quoted one of its student employees who discovered that "office work is not an easy, two-bit job."

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Types of Participation Favored by Units

Academic Units. In response to the question "Does your unit favor certain types of student participation over other types?" one unit answered, "Yes," eleven answered "No" and two answered "Don't know."

Of those units referring to formalized procedures, preference was split almost equally between more formal (9) and more informal (8) types of participation. For instance, several units specified a preference for student participation through meetings and committees. One noted that "the committee form invites student input under circumstances that minimize the possibility of breaches of confidentiality;" another that "it enables students to deliberate on an equal basis with faculty, to participate in the usual processes of change, compromise and amendment, and ultimately to vote."

On the other hand, one unit said that, because of its small size, "we find informal discussions on a small scale far more successful and useful than more formal structures needed to ensure sufficient interchange of ideas in larger departments." And another said they "prefer continuous informal direct student confrontation to allow two-way expression of questions and answers."

An even more formal and limited procedure than committee participation was indicated by one department which reported, "the faculty prefer that the department chair solicit student opinions and report them to the faculty." Another said their preferred form of participation was "constructive and rational." And a third said, "by default, it seems we favor little or no participation."

Nonacademic Units. There was little agreement here, either, among those units expressing a preference. Nine said they favored formal or committee participation, six favored informal. Six also mentioned "full participation," and two units said they preferred long-term to individual-issue participation.

Among those preferring informal participation, one respondent said that "highly formalized processes tend to be cumbersome and often give the illusion of a totally democratic process, while in fact they may not be." And another unit noted that informal participation "tends to be made without ulterior purposes."

One unit noted that involvement in their operations "requires in-depth preparation and hence a long-term commitment," while another said that "long-term student participation is more difficult to achieve than issue-oriented advice and input. This reality is contrary to our preference but both types are valuable."

Opportunities for Increased Participation

Academic Units. Of those units responding more or less directly to this question, 24 said Yes, there are further opportunities, six said No, and 7 said possibly, while another five units felt their level of student involvement was already sufficient.

Nine units suggested increased participation through formal mechanisms, such as committees and regular meetings. And two respondents addressed the question of increasing undergraduate participation. One said: "I suspect that the undergraduate voice could be granted a better hearing," and another that "I would like to encourage more participation by undergraduates; however, this has proven to be very difficult."

Indeed, a large number of units felt that the chief factor limiting student participation was the time, energy and interest of the students themselves. A sampling of responses indicates this general feeling:

"The pressure of studies and other activities puts a limit on the amount of time students are able to devote to work on committees."

"I believe we are approaching the limit of student time and interest."

"Declining interest resulted in termination of participation, first at the undergraduate level, then at the graduate level."

"It is a two-way street. I have found it necessary to stimulate the students to organize and designate their representatives. I will continue to do so, but I am not optimistic that there will be active participants on a continuing basis."

"Perhaps, if there were greater student interest in policy matters and less concern with their academic progress."

Only one unit disagreed, stating: "Students are increasingly taking interest in program changes and it is my impression that faculty members appreciate this input."

Nonacademic Units. Twenty-one of those responding to this question felt there were opportunities for more student participation in their unit; two others said there might be, while 24 units either said No or indicated the question was not applicable to them.

Of those units citing specifics, seven indicated further opportunities on committees, two suggested more student surveys and another two said there were likely to be more opportunities through unit growth. One unit noted: "Our students are not shy and we are very approachable."

Lack of student interest was not mentioned as often as it was among academic units, but it was noted. One respondent commented: "Our major problem has been to find a sufficient number of interested students to fill the vacant [committee] slots." And another said: "It has been my experience that students are not very interested in the decisions made in our unit. Attempts I have made in the past have met with limited success in the beginning and spiralled down to zero participation after 6-12 months."

Attitudes Toward Student Participation

The open-ended nature of the questionnaire provided opportunities to offer general comments reflecting underlying attitudes. And while the bulk of these comments were favorable to student participation, there were some dissenters.

On the favorable side, one unit stated: "Many students are amazingly perceptive and more objective in their viewpoint than faculty who have known their peers for long periods of time." Another said, "they have a sense of the immediate which is not always shared by faculty and they are current on certain events on the campus with which some faculty are not."

One respondent said he was "impressed with the ability of students to analyze problems and recommend solutions," while another noted that "when they have all of the information relating to a problem, they are very capable of making good decisions. On problems related to teaching and student activities they can add perspectives for consideration which might be overlooked otherwise."

Some respondents, however, felt that some limitations on student participation were appropriate. One commented: "It is at least arguable that faculty require some opportunities to discuss issues unfettered by the presence of students--particularly since we elicit student participation in other situations." Another said: "My personal opinion is that faculty wish to keep decisions at a faculty level."

One respondent put the matter even more strongly: "I, and I believe most of our faculty, would strenuously oppose any policy that would give students a voting right in the departmental decision-making process." The statement continued, "some of us feel that the increasing dependence on student evaluations as the sole criterion in judging teaching effectiveness has eroded the quality of instruction in the University."

Two respondents expressed some doubts about the "representativeness" of student representation. One said, "it is my experience that most student organizations are not representative of the general student population." And a second commented: "I have found too often that isolated students who are eager to serve on committees have a personal axe to grind and are not speaking for the rest of the students."

Finally, one stated that there were, indeed, opportunities to increase participation in his unit. "Certainly," he commented; "we could change into a South American style university where the professional student-activist runs everything."

APPENDIX I

Office of the President
April 12, 1979

Presidential Statement of
University Policy on
Student Participation in Governance

As members of the campus community, students have a substantial interest in the governance of the University. Their participation has increased significantly in the last decade, and the University has benefited from it. It is the intent of this policy to reaffirm the University's commitment to the principle of student involvement in governance in both administrative and academic areas and to state the primary purposes and goals of that involvement.

This commitment is based on the premise that student participation is vital to a vigorous intellectual exchange and the furtherance of the objectives of University education and research. Appropriate, effective, and productive student involvement, consistent with the development of policies that reflect the total needs of the University, is the goal.

The governance of the University involves more than the process of making decisions. The process of governance provides a forum for group interaction, expression of concerns, exploration of feasible solutions, and reconciliation of diverse viewpoints. Within this context, student participation serves several functions.

First, it is important to the sound development of policy. Student views and advice, often from special perspectives, provide for more informed University decision making. Participation should be encouraged and strengthened through the involvement of all levels of student representation.

Second, there is a recognition that students have a vital interest in decisions directly related to policies and programs affecting their academic and non-academic experience at the University. Clear procedures are required to ensure that students are afforded access to needed information, an opportunity to share ideas, and encouragement to express concerns, both formally and informally.

Finally, student participation is crucial to ensure that student viewpoints are considered on issues of importance to the University community. This communication provides opportunities for testing assumptions, for understanding the attitudes of others, for sharing information, and for developing understanding and mutual trust among constituencies. The special nature of the University requires a sense of community. While not every decision can be wholly satisfactory to all parties, the governance process should provide a forum for candid discussion.

While the University has experienced rapid development in the area of student participation in governance in recent years, there are some problems and ambiguities which remain unresolved. In seeking a resolution of these, efforts should continue to be directed toward improving not only the extent but also the quality and effectiveness of student involvement. To these ends, the University must work to achieve several goals.

First, the processes central to student involvement, including the selection, training, and continuity of student participants, need to be reexamined and to be clearly understood. Care should be taken, in particular, that the process of reaching decisions in campus governance is openly communicated and well understood. Second, building on existing mechanisms, means for student participation in administrative and academic areas should be developed and implemented at the campus and Systemwide Administration levels; it is important that a variety of ways be provided to ensure that the University gains full benefit from student participation in those areas. Third, areas where students are not now participating need to be examined. In this regard, ways should be sought to enhance student involvement in academic departments, where important decisions that affect students are made.

In order to achieve the goals of this policy, each campus is charged with the development of a plan for student participation. It is understood that these plans, which will be developed under the direction of the Chancellors, will focus on administrative matters. In the development of these campus plans, there should be broad consultation with the campus community, including formal consultation with student governments and the Academic Senate. The type and extent of student participation in the administrative areas of governance must be examined and defined. Essential to the success of such plans is a review of the procedures presently used by campus academic and administrative departments, as well as those used by student governments and other student organizations. Matters which have been delegated by The Regents to the Academic Senate are beyond the scope of these campus plans, but I will encourage direct discussions between students and the Academic Senate on student participation in the deliberations of the Senate. The development of plans for student participation in institutional governance will provide the campuses with an opportunity not only to develop formal procedures where they do not now exist, but also to review existing participation.

In developing their plans, campuses should consider the research data and analysis of the staff and task force reports on "The Evaluation of Student Participation in the Governance of the University of California" (August, 1977). Each campus plan should provide for periodic review and evaluation of progress toward implementation of the plan. Campus plans will be submitted to the President no later than June 1980 for review and concurrence.

David S. Saxon
President

APPENDIX II
-1-
Questionnaire

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE AT UC DAVIS

This questionnaire is designed to elicit information regarding the participation of students in the various decision-making processes within each campus unit. If these questions do not fit your unit's situation, please feel free to add, explain or otherwise respond on an individual basis.

I. What opportunities exist in your unit for participation by students?

FACULTY/STAFF MEETINGS

Type of Meeting	Approx No. of Persons Attending a Typical Mtg: Students Grad	Students UG	Faculty	Staff	Frequency of Meetings	Student Role: Advice	Limited Voting Priv	Full Voting Priv
_____	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___

How are students selected for attendance? _____

COMMITTEES

Name/Type	Approx No. of Persons Appointed to a Committee: Students Grad	Students UG	Faculty	Staff	Frequency of Meetings	Student Role: Advice	Limited Voting Priv	Full Voting Priv
_____	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___	_____	___	___	___

How are students selected for membership? _____

COURSE/PROGRAM EVALUATIONS ____Yes ____No ____Not Applicable

Frequency of Eval.: ____ Every time it's offered ____ Instructor's Choice
____ Other _____

Eval. Form Used: _____

SURVEYS OF STUDENTS *(List approximate dates of formal or informal surveys during the last academic year, who was surveyed, and the purposes of the surveys):*

_____

_____

_____

STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS WITHIN YOUR UNIT

Name of Association	Purpose	Number of Members: Grad	UG	Faculty	Staff
_____	_____	___	___	___	___
_____	_____	___	___	___	___
_____	_____	___	___	___	___

WDH: 7/25/79

INFORMAL INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE *(Indicate the extent to which the following groups were involved in decision making during the last academic year.)*

	No Involvement	Involvement in 1 to 2 Issues	Involvement in 3 or More Issues	Kinds of Issues
Teaching Assist.				
Research Assist.				
Student Employees				
Other Students				

Please answer the following questions on a separate sheet of paper and attach to the questionnaire.

II. What is the formal basis (i.e., written policy, long-term custom, or ad hoc decision) for student participation in your unit?

III. What types of decisions are made with student participation? What types of decisions are made without student participation?

IV. In general, what are the main purposes of the different forms of student participation in your unit?

V. Does your unit favor certain types of student participation over other types? For what reasons?

VI. Are there opportunities within your unit for increased participation by students?

VII. What has been the value to your unit of student participation? What has been the value to students of this participation?

RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ATTACHMENTS BY FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7 TO:

VC-STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICE
541 MRAK HALL

NAME _____

TITLE _____

UNIT NAME _____

WDH:7/25/79

APPENDIX III

Units Responding to the Survey

ACADEMIC UNITS

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Agricultural Economics
Agricultural Engineering
Agronomy and Range Science
Animal Science
Applied Behavioral Sciences
Avian Sciences
Biochemistry and Biophysics
Environmental Horticulture
Environmental Planning & Management
Food Science and Technology
Genetics
Land, Air & Water Resources
Nematology
Nutrition
Plant Pathology
Textiles & Clothing
Vegetable Crops
Viticulture & Enology
Wildlife & Fisheries Biology

College of Engineering

Chemical Engineering
Civil Engineering
Electrical Engineering
Mechanical Engineering

College of Letters and Science

Anthropology
Art
Bacteriology
Botany
Chemistry
Economics
English
English A/Subject A
French and Italian
Geography Department
Geology
History
Mathematics
Military Science
Music
Physical Education
Physics
Psychology
Religious Studies
Rhetoric
Sociology
Zoology

School of Medicine

Family Practice
Human Anatomy
Human Physiology
Medicine
Nuclear Medicine
Obstetrics & Gynecology
Pathology
Pharmacology

Other

Graduate Division
Law School
Veterinary Pathology Department

10/79

Appendix III
Continued

NONACADEMIC UNITS

Admissions (Undergraduate)
Academic Affairs
Advising Services
Agricultural History
Associated Students UCD

Bookstore
Business and Finance

Campus Development Office
Chancellor
Committee for Arts & Lectures
Consumer Research Center
Cooperative Extension
Counseling Center

Equipment Management
Executive Vice Chancellor

Financial Aid Office
Fire Department

Handicapped Students, Services to
Health Sciences Library
Hospital Education Affairs Office
Housing Office

Law Library
Learning Skills Center
Library

Medical Center, UCD

Planning and Analysis Office
Police Department

Recreation Hall
Relations with Schools
Registrar's Office

Student Development Office
Student Health Center
Student Special Services

Teaching Resources Center

Union & Recreation Services
Upward Bound Program

Veterans' Affairs
Visitor Services and Ceremonies

Women's Resources & Research Center
Work-Learn & Career Planning &
Placement

10/79

APPENDIX IV

Summary of Responses

Meetings and Committees - Academic Units

	Meetings (n=67)	Committees (n=153)
With grad students attending	46%	65%
With undergrads attending	21%	29%
With both attending	15%	10%
With no students attending	48%	16%
# faculty/staff participants	587	636
# grad student participants	170	314
# undergrad participants	70	102
Student Role	(n=39)	(n=99)
Full voting rights	5%	46%
Limited voting rights	21%	15%
Advisory role only	74%	38%
Selection Process	(n=37)	(n=123)
By other students	54%	56%
By faculty/administration	11%	26%
By invitation	14%	4%
Everyone welcome	14%	-
By virtue of job	8%	-
Volunteers	-	13%

Meetings and Committees - Nonacademic Units

(Many nonacademic units did not distinguish between meetings and committees, so they have been tallied together. In addition, most nonacademic units responded with information regarding only those groups which did have student participation; thus, the proportion of meetings and committees with and without student involvement cannot be determined.)

Meetings/Committees	(n=95)
With grad students attending	60%
With undergrads attending	89%
With both attending	51%
# faculty/staff participants	520
# grad student participants	129
# undergrad participants	451

Student Role	(n=95)
Full voting rights	62%
Limited voting rights	6%
Advisory role only	32%

Selection Process	(n=88)
By other students	17%
By faculty/administration	53%
By virtue of job	23%
By virtue of membership, status	5%
Other	2%

Appendix IV
Continued

Other Forms of Participation	Academic Units	Nonacademic Units
Course/Program Evaluations	(n=47)	(n=13)
Every time offered	81%	
Instructor's choice	11%	(not applicable)
At least once a year	4%	
Other	4%	
Evaluation Form Used	(n=48)	
Departmental form	44%	
Viewpoint form	13%	
Instructor's choice	25%	(not applicable)
Teaching Resource Center form	4%	
Varies	15%	
Surveys of Students	(n=21)	(n=26)
Formal survey	71%	73%
Informal survey	29%	27%
Survey Purposes	(n=27)	(n=27)
Student opinion	44%	52%
Unit evaluation	37%	30%
Data-gathering	19%	19%
Student Associations	(n=83)	(n=18)
Primarily grad students	51%	39%
Primarily undergrad	29%	33%
Intended for both	20%	28%
Informal Participation		
Teaching Assistants	(n=31)	(n=2)
1-2 issues	48%	-
3+ issues	52%	100%
Research Assistants	(n=13)	(n=3)
1-2 issues	69%	33%
3+ issues	31%	67%
Student Employees	(n=10)	(n=26)
1-2 issues	60%	31%
3+ issues	40%	69%
Other Students	(n=22)	(n=16)
1-2 issues	41%	6%
3+ issues	59%	94%

Appendix IV
Continued

	Academic Units	Nonacademic Units	Totals
Basis of Participation	(n=50)	(n=45)[1]	(n=95)
Formal written/voted policy	22%	36%	28%
Long-term custom	30%	24%	27%
Ad hoc/situational	20%	7%	14%
No policy	28%	20%	24%
Employee participation	-	13%	13%
Opportunities to Increase Part.	(n=28)	(n=17)	(n=45)
Yes	71%	65%	69%
No	18%	18%	18%
Maybe	11%	18%	13%
Purposes of Participation	(n=52)[2]	(n=40)[2]	
Get student input/expertise	54%	35%	
Educ., experience for student	13%	23%	
Communicate to students	8%	13%	
Interaction/morale	10%	18%	
Help/improve unit functioning	15%	13%	
Value of Participation	(n=71)[2]	(n=40)[2]	
Interaction/morale/understanding	24%	16%	
Get student input/opinion	15%	23%	
Help/improve unit functioning	14%	11%	
Educ/experience for students	10%	38%	
Students understand U processes	23%	12%	
Give students voice in own affairs	10%	*	
Limited; very little	4%	*	

[1] Some units reported different policies for different types of participation.

[2] Many units cited more than one item; n = number of items mentioned.

* Less than 1%.

APPENDIX V

Scope of the Responses

Types of Decisions In Which Students Participate

(Any decision mentioned at least once is included in this list.)

Academic Units

With Student Participation

Promotions
Merit decisions
Selection of incoming students
Grading standards
Faculty recruitment/hiring
Program development/requirements
Courses
Allocation of research funds
Facilities/space utilizations
The ones that involve them
Course scheduling
Student Associations
Seminar speakers
Equipment/facility needs
Award nominees
Commencement speaker
Student Activities

Without Student Participation

Promotions
Merit decision
Graduate student admissions
Grading standards
Personnel matters
Curriculum
Class content
Grants
Day-to-day admin. decisions
The ones that don't involve them
Budget matters/fiscal policies
Faculty projects
Student hirings (RA's, etc.)
Student readmissions
Routine department business
Issues requiring confidentiality

Nonacademic Units

Budget decisions
Program/policy development
Hiring
Staffing patterns
Internal operations
Equipment purchases
Admissions decisions
Few
Curricular matters
Educational matters
Commencement
Research methods/sites/other decisions
Long-range planning
Student-employee training
Unit evaluation process
Maintenance decisions/priorities
Rate-setting
Publications content

Budget decisions
Unit mission
Personnel matters
Staff work-load
Administrative decisions
Ordering materials
Admissions policy/procedure
Many
Disciplinary matters
Faculty/admin proglems
Staff performance appraisals
Program cost-effectiveness
Compliance requirements
Issues requiring confidentiality
Daily staff work assignments
Routine office procedures

Appendix V
Continued

Purposes of Student Participation

Academic Units	Nonacademic Units
Get student reactions/input	Get student opinions/input/advice
Ensure meeting students' needs	Consideration of student needs
Develop leadership skills	Provide leadership opportunities
Student-faculty interaction	Improve communication
Improve instruction	Improve services to students
Person-power to get work done	Use of student skills/info/expertise
Training for future acad. careers	Provide work experience/employment
Give students sense of community	Evaluate unit programs/services
Evaluate departmental programs	Provide non-classroom educational exper.
Resolution of problems	
Participatory management	
So students know reason for decisions	
Conform to President's directive	

Types of Participation Favored

Academic Units	Nonacademic Units
Committee membership	Formal committee participation
Flexible/informal/one-to-one	Informal participation
At all levels	Full participation
When they are informed/capable	Students who are trained/prepared
Student groups/organizations	Constituency representation
Through discussions	Individual opinions
Ad hoc interest groups	Volunteer assistance
At regular faculty meetings	Long-term commitment
Through department chair	Through internships
Consensus decision-making	Through student employment
Constructive and rational	

Appendix V
Continued

Value of Student Participation

Value to the Unit

Academic Units	Nonacademic Units
Student input/viewpoint/advice	Student input/viewpoint/advice
Improve instruction	Improve unit services
Ensure meeting student needs	Knowledge of student needs
Morale	Esprit de corps/morale
Operate student activities	Help unit do its work
Get student expertise	Help decision-making/problem-solving
Students understand reasons for decisions	Fewer complaints about services
Students understand problems of decision-making	Reduce abuse of equipment/facilities
Develop cooperative relationship	Help evaluate unit
Students sensitive to faculty/ administration problems	

Value to the Students

Understand Univ. operations/policy/ decision-making process	Understand Univ. operations/problems; how the "System" works
Have voice in own affairs	Have influence on policies/procedures
Interaction with faculty	Rapport with University people
Morale/feeling of involvement	Outlet for desire to be involved
Training in leadership, decision-making	Develop job/career skills
Informal advising from faculty	Career opportunities/job contacts
Experience in self-expression	Develop skill at working with a group
Better evaluation because known to faculty	Get work experience
	Sense of satisfaction/accomplishment
	Get faculty/staff viewpoints
	Equitable treatment for all students